

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SORAYA MARIA RIGOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT,
et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:25-cv-00243-TLN-SCR

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this action, which is referred to the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On January 17, 2025, Plaintiff filed a complaint and a motion to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). ECF Nos. 1 and 2. On May 16, 2025, this Court screened the complaint as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and found the complaint was deficient in that it failed to state a claim and appeared to be time-barred and barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 483–87 (1994). The Court’s order provided Plaintiff 30 days to file an amended complaint that addresses the defects set forth in the screening order. ECF No. 3 at 7. The order warned that failure to comply may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed. *Id.* More than 30 days have passed, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.

////

1 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **Plaintiff shall show cause, in**
2 **writing, within 14 days**, why the failure to file an amended complaint should not result in a
3 recommendation that this case be dismissed based on failure to state a claim. Plaintiff may
4 respond by filing an amended complaint that complies with the Court's prior order. If Plaintiff
5 fails to respond, the court will recommend dismissal of this case. *See* Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(b); Local
6 Rule 110.

7 SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: June 26, 2025

9 
10 SEAN C. RIORDAN
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28